

Application Serial No.: 09/853,164

1

REMARKS

2 The office action states:

3
4 *Claims 1-46 are presented. Claims 1-20, 23, 28-46 are allowed or allowable. Claims*
5 *21-22, 24-27 are rejected. Claim 23 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected*
6 *base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the*
7 *limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.*

8 CLAIM REJECTIONS

9 *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

10 *The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form*
11 *the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action: A person shall*
12 *be entitled to a patent unless -*

13 *(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in*
14 *a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the*
15 *applicant for a patent.*

16 *Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a as being clearly anticipated by admissions*
17 *against prior art ("AP"). Regarding claim 21, APA teaches "an apparatus enabling at*
18 *least one client to access restricted information from an origin web-server through a*
19 *semi-trusted web-server, said apparatus comprising: an authenticator to validate said*
20 *least one client; a credential creator to create a client credential having client-specific*
21 *environment information each least one client; and a correlator for matching said at*
22 *least one client to the client credential (pages 1-3, which notes such existence of multiple*
23 *servers).*

24 In response, applicants respectfully state that the APA does not teach the existence of such
25 apparatus. Claim 21 is amended to better point out the novelty over the APA by stating, that
26 said authenticator, credential creator, and correlator work in combination to enable the client(s)
27 to more safely access restricted information from the origin web-server through the semi-trusted
28 web-server.

29 The APA describes the prior art as "limited to non-sensitive data so that access control is not
30 required". The concluding text on pages 1-3 is used to motivate the need for having the feature of
31 content distribution be extended to new types of data on the web, such as "subscription services

Docket No.: YOR920010426US1

-12-

Application Serial No.: 09/853,164

1 and personalized content". It is used to introduce the notion and definition of the semi-trusted
2 proxy web-server, and points out that the "situation is complicated" to handle such type of
3 content. The text for motivating the invention does not imply the prior existence of a solution to
4 this problem.

5 The applicants respectfully point out that while the apparatus for a client to obtain restricted
6 information directly from an origin web-server does exist in prior art, the apparatus for obtaining
7 such restricted information indirectly via a semi-trusted web-server does not exist. Thus claim
8 21, and all claims that depend thereupon, are allowable over the ATA.

9 *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

10 *The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
11 obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:*

12 *(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
13 described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject
14 matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole
15 would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
16 skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated
17 by the manner in which the invention was made.*

18 *Claims 22,24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
19 admissions against prior art. ("APA"). Claims 22, 24-27 depend from claim 21. APA
20 teaches as noted in the rejection of claim 21. Regarding claims 22,24,25 (cookies, etc.),
21 these passages of APA are not explicit about such use of cookies as in the claims.
22 Nevertheless, it was well known in the art to use cookies for the motivation of having
23 easier interface to clients. Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in
24 the art at the time of the claimed invention to modify APA for the motivation noted in the
25 previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.*

26 In response, applicants respectfully state that the claims 22, 24-27 are exemplary claims that
27 provide further elements of the novel and non-obvious apparatus described in claim 21. They are
28 allowable dependent claims in themselves and for the reasons given earlier regarding claim 21.

29 *Regarding claims 26, 27 (keys, etc.), these passages of APA are not explicit about such
30 use of keys as in the claims. Nevertheless, it was well known in the art to use keys for the
31 motivation of security. Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in*

Docket No.: YOR920010426US1

-13-

Application Serial No.: 09/853,164

the art at the time of the claimed invention to modify APA for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

3 In response, applicants respectfully state that the prior art involving use of keys involves two
4 parties that are communicating. In claims 26 and 27, the use of keys involves three parties, the
5 client, the origin web-server, and the semi-trusted web-server. The exchange and sharing of keys
6 between three entities for the purpose of transferring content is not known in prior art. Therefore,
7 the exchanges of keys as described for this purpose are novel, and not obvious, and should be
8 allowed. Claims 26 and 27 are exemplary claims that provide further elements of the novel and
9 non-obvious apparatus described in claim 21. They are allowable dependent claims in themselves
10 and for the reasons given earlier regarding claim 21.

11 Thus, claims 1-46 are allowable. Claim 21 is amended. Dependent claims 22, 24-27 stand as
12 originally filed and are allowable for their own novelties and for being dependent on an
13 allowable claim 21. A listing of the claims is provided as required in the new USPTO
14 amendment practice per 37 CFR 1.121.

15 It is anticipated that this amendment brings the application to allowance of claims 1-46, and
16 favorable action is respectfully solicited. In the unlikely event that any claim remains rejected,
17 please contact the undersigned by phone in order to discuss the application.

18 Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper to deposit account 09-0468.

19 Respectfully submitted,

20
21
22
23
24
25 IBM CORPORATION
26 Intellectual Property Law Dept.
27 P.O. Box 218
28 Yorktown Heights, New York 10598

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Louis P. Herzberg
Reg. No. 41,500
Voice Tel. (914) 945-2885
Fax. (914) 945-3281

IBM CORPORATION
Intellectual Property Law Dept.
P.O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598

Docket No.: YOR920010426US1

-14-